

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 have been amended to more particularly point out Applicant's invention.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to specifically point out the network is a TDM (time division multiplexing) network, and that the redirecting of supplementary service communications request occurs "over the TDM communications network". Independent claims 5, 9, and 13 have been similarly amended. Support for TDM networks can be found in the Specification at page 7, lines 1 and 7, and other examples of embodiments incorporating ISDN, which is a type of TDM network. The present invention is applicable to TDM networks.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dulman, U.S. Patent No. 5,915,008 ("Dulman"). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention must be present in a single, prior reference. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Dulman.

Dulman applies to packet switched networks (see Abstract). Dulman does not teach or suggest TDM networks, and specifically does not teach or suggest redirecting supplementary service communications requests over a TDM communications network as set forth in the claims. Dulman does not appear to have anything to do with TDM networks or redirecting supplementary service communication requests over them. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Page 2 of the Official Action states that "Dulman teaches a broader, general overview of the aspects of the claimed invention." It is respectfully submitted that Dulman is specific to packet switching for carrier applications, while the present

invention as claimed relates to a TDM network for enterprise applications, which is distinct from Dulman.

Page 3 of the Official Action states that "Furthermore, Dulman teaches link optimization in the form of considering how to route calls/requests/data information according to least used and least cost routes." It is respectfully submitted that, as described in the Specification (e.g., page 2, lines 18-22) and claims 1, 5, 9, the present invention as claimed relates to the optimization of network resource usage, and not link optimization for the purpose of considering the least used and least cost routes.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-6 and 8-12 as presented herein are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman. Claim 7 depends from claim 5, which has been discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-12.

Claims 13-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman in view of Lin et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,610 ("Lin"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Dulman or Lin, either singly or in combination. Dulman has been discussed above. Lin is relied on for allegedly teaching lists of servers' addresses. However, like Dulman, Lin does not appear to relate, inter alia, to "intercept[ing] and redirect[ing] supplementary service functions for handling to another server," as generally recited in the claims at issue. Also, like Dulman, Lin relates to carrier applications and not enterprise applications. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 13-19.

Serial No.: 09/086,294

Attorney Docket No. 98P7528US03

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 13-19 as presented herein are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully requested,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Francis Montgomery".

Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130